synergistics

Kelly Lake to Cheekye Substation
Second 500 kV Transmission Line

Public Consultation Report
Phases 1 & 2

Submitted to:
B.C. Hydro
April 1991

91-06900/

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data
Synergistics Consulting Limited
Kelly Lake to Cheekye Substation second 500 kV transmission line public consultation report phases 1 & 2

Contents: [v.1]. [Main report]
ISBN 0-7726-1331-1 (v.1)

1. Electric lines - British Columbia - Squamish-Lillooet - Public opinion. 2. Electric power transmission - British Columbia - Squamish-Lillooet-Public opinion. I. B.C. Hydro. II. Title.

TK3144.S96 1991 621.319'13 C91-092152-0

synergistics

Kelly Lake to Cheekye Substation
Second 500 kV Transmission Line

Public Consultation Report
Phases 1 & 2

Submitted to:
B.C. Hydro
April 1991

Synergistics Consulting Limited
Élaboration synergie limitée
TORONTO • OTTAWA • VANCOUVER

Suite 400-12 Water Street
Vancouver, B.C. V6B 1A5
Telephone (604) 684-7760
Fax (604) 681-3546

Table of Contents

		Page
Executive Summary		
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Project Background	1
1.2	Scope of Work	1
1.3	Consultation Goals and Objectives	2
1.4	Report Organization	3
2.0	METHODOLOGY	4
2.1	Overview and Schedule	4
2.2	Phase One Consultation	7
2.3	Phase Two Consultation	11
3.0	FINDINGS	16
3.1	Introduction	16
3.2	Response to Open Houses	16
3.3	Findings by Community and Stakeholder Group	18
3.4	Summary of Public Information Requests (PIRs)	37
4.0	ANALYSIS	39
4.1	Introduction	39
4.2	Key Region-wide Issues, Phase 1	39
4.3	Key Region-wide Issues, Phase 2	41
4.4	Evaluation of the Consultation Process	44
5.0	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	46

(Separately Bound)

APPENDICES Volume I

APPENDICES Volume II

ADDENDUM - *Phase 3* Public Consultation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Early in 1989, B.C. Hydro reactivated studies for a second 500 kV transmission line between the Kelly Lake Substation, near Clinton, and the Cheekye Substation, near Squamish. This proposed transmission line was originally studied in the late 1970s and early 1980s but was put on hold as a result of a decline in load growth in the Lower Mainland and on Vancouver Island.

This report summarizes the public consultation program (Phase 1 from May 1 to November 30, 1989 and Phase 2 from mid-April to September 30, 1990) undertaken by B.C. Hydro with assistance from Synergistics Consulting Limited. The report identifies a number of key issues and makes recommendations for on-going communication with the communities and groups potentially affected by the project.

The overall goal of the public consultation program is to address issues and concerns identified by the public, respond to these concerns with further information or clarification, and reflect these comments and concerns, wherever possible, in project planning.

Preliminary technical and environmental studies, together with the Phase 1 public consultation program, were completed by November 1989. A generally favoured route (the existing transmission line corridor with some alterations) was identified based on the result of these studies and on public feedback. In some areas, however, a generally favoured route could not be identified (including Whistler, the Lower Cheakamus Valley, and through Indian Reserves), and further study of routing options was undertaken.

From November 1989 to May 1990, when the Phase 2 public consultation program field activity was initiated, Hydro continued to respond to requests for information and to meet with interested groups and individuals. Phase 2 activities were designed to obtain the public's views of the generally favoured route and to continue discussions with all interested individuals and groups.

The public consultation program included:

- preparation and distribution of public information materials including a press advisory, project newsletters, Preliminary Planning Report and a Planning Perspective report;
- contact by letter and telephone with elected officials, interest groups and interested individuals in the study area to inform them about the project status and public consultation activities;
- special meetings with key interest groups in the study area to discuss their specific concerns associated with the project; and,

- two series of Open Houses (eight in Phase 1 and seven in Phase 2) which provided the public with up-to-date information and with an opportunity to discuss their concerns with Project Team representatives.

The study area for public consultation purposes was a broad corridor stretching from Clinton in the north to Squamish in the south. This also included population centres at Lillooet, Seton Portage, Shalalth, Pemberton, Mount Currie, D'Arcy, Birken and Whistler.

Throughout the consultation process, B.C. Hydro provided native Bands in the study area with information on project planning and with opportunities to participate in the process. The following Bands, as well as the Lillooet Tribal Council, were included in all mailouts and newsletter distribution: Anderson Lake Band, Bridge River Band, Cayoose Creek Band, Fountain Band, Lillooet Band, Mount Currie Band, Pavilion Band, Seton Lake Band, Squamish Band and Whispering Pines Band. Meetings were held with Anderson Lake, Bridge River, Mount Currie, Pavilion and Seton Lake Bands. Meetings with the Lillooet Tribal Council occurred on several occasions with representation from member Bands as follows: Bridge River, Cayoose Creek, Fountain, Lillooet, Pavilion and Seton Lake Bands. During the first phase of consultation, an Open House was held on the Seton Lake Reserve.

The outcome of these events can be summarized as follows:

- A memorandum of understanding regarding right-of-way requirements was reached with the Anderson Lake Band.

- The Bands represented by the Lillooet Tribal Council expressed a willingness to discuss their concerns with B.C. Hydro and several meetings were held; however, at the time of writing this report no agreement had been reached. The Bands stated that they wanted past grievances with B.C. Hydro addressed in the negotiating process prior to addressing project-related issues. Details of Hydro's consultation with Bands can be found in a separate document titled *Kelly Lake-Cheekye Native Consultation.*

The main issues identified through the consultation program are listed below; the order of the issues does not reflect their importance. It should be pointed out that this list includes some issues which are not directly related to the project, though they may be related in the public's perception. These issues include: electricity/energy conservation, and PCB storage.

Project Justification/ Long Range Planning

Project Justification

Need for the line for domestic purposes or any export purposes.

Electricity Export

Although this project is justified on the basis of serving domestic customers, there was opposition expressed to the concept of firm electricity export contracts.

Benefits for Impacted Communities

A desire for jobs, taxation benefits and upgraded roads, by communities that bear the direct impacts of development.

Future Development

Desire to avoid impacting future use of prime developable land in valley bottoms.

Long Range Planning

A concern that even more transmission lines will be built in the Kelly Lake-Cheekye corridor in the future; fear that the existing route has been identified as an "energy corridor".

Property and Visual Impacts

Property values and other property impacts

Potential for project to decrease property values.

Negative impacts on land use and lifestyle.

Visual Impacts

The need for Hydro to reduce adverse visual impacts (eg. consolidate lines, reduce clearing).

Release of 2L1 land

Desire to see release of easements and other property forming 2L1 right-of-way (the existing 230 kV line from Shalalth to Cheekye) where it is not required for the new project or other developments.

Health and Environment

EMF effects

Perceived potential for health risks and other impacts from electric and magnetic fields.

Environmental Impacts

Support for protection of wilderness by keeping transmission lines in the existing corridor.

Vegetation Management

Opposition to use of chemical herbicides on the transmission line right-of-way.

Biological control or hand/ machine clearing favoured.

Route Preferences

Support for "generally favoured" route

There is widespread support for the "generally favoured" route (as identified at the conclusion of Phase 1 consultation). This, for the most part, utilizes the existing transmission corridor.

Support for the High Cheakamus route

Residents of Lower Cheakamus (and others) are supportive of this option which locates the proposed transmission line east of Highway 99, away from the Cheakamus Valley, and would remove the proposed line from the residential area of the valley.

Pavilion Route favoured over Antoine Route

Non-native residents acknowledge potential difficulties in obtaining agreements for routing through Pavilion and Bridge River Reserves.

A relatively isolated community in Moha area (Yalakom River, Antoine and Swift Creek Valleys) favours the use of the existing corridor and is adamantly opposed to use of Antoine Route option.

Anderson Route favoured over Duffey Route

Strong support (especially by Village of Lillooet and the Squamish Lillooet Regional District) for maintaining scenic qualities of Duffey Route for future tourism activities.

Desire to protect natural quality of wilderness in the Duffey region.

Limited interest in alternate routes

Desire to protect wilderness; locate proposed transmission lines in existing corridors.

Other Concerns

Property owners expressed specific concerns about routing options which would directly affect them.

Involvement of native Bands

Little input has been received from Indian Bands regarding routing preferences. Several bands asked that historical grievances be addressed before they would express views on new projects. The Lillooet Tribal Council did advise that they preferred the generally favoured route through Indian Reserves on the existing transmission corridor, as it created fewer impacts.

Improved Attitude Towards B.C. Hydro

Hydro is viewed as more open and responsive in its consultation efforts than it was in the early 1980s when the Kelly Lake–Cheekye transmission line was originally proposed. The project was subsequently put on hold due to lack of demand growth during the recession of the 1980s.

Issues not Directly Related to the Project

Energy Conservation

There was interest expressed in seeing B.C. Hydro make a greater commitment to energy conservation, before developing new projects.

PCB Storage

Although this issue is not directly related to the Kelly Lake-Cheekye project, there is concern in Birken and Pemberton that Hydro has not adequately addressed the issue of PCB removal or secure PCB storage at the Creekside Capacitor station.

Recommendations for a Future Consultation Process

B.C. Hydro's commitment to an open consultation/communication process has been appreciated by the communities and groups affected by the project. It is the view of the consultant that Hydro should make a commitment to continue this process, if the project is approved, throughout the survey, clearing, construction, and early operation phases.

Specifically, the following actions could be undertaken:

Immediate

- ❑ Maintain a pro-active approach to meeting with the Lillooet Tribal Council and with unaffiliated Bands.

- ❑ Prepare and distribute a third project newsletter which would include a review of routing, the consultation program, and project application status.

On-going

- ❑ Maintain distribution of current information about the electric and magnetic field (EMF) effects.
- ❑ Maintain dialogue with residents of all affected areas, including native people, throughout project planning and, if approval is received, throughout project construction. Also maintain contact with elected officials and government agencies and key stakeholders.
- ❑ Ensure that area communities are informed about employment opportunities and construction impacts, as appropriate.
- ❑ Continue responding to public inquiries.
- ❑ Evaluate consultation undertaken to the present and continue to monitor future consultation.
- ❑ Maintain toll-free project information line and the Public Information Request (PIR) system.
- ❑ Ensure that project commitments are met.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Background

B.C. Hydro first planned a second 500 kV transmission line between the Kelly Lake and Cheekye substations in the late 1970s to supply the growing demand for electricity in the Lower Mainland and on Vancouver Island. The project was subsequently deferred due to declining load growth.

Planning studies for the Kelly Lake-Cheekye transmission line were reactivated in the spring of 1989. The current proposal differs considerably from the initial one; there is no longer a need for a double circuit line and Hydro is taking a broader look at a variety of potential routes. The current proposal does not require a substation at the existing Creekside capacitor station (though Hydro will need a capacitor station near the mid point on the line, likely an expansion of the Creekside Capacitor Station, if the existing corridor is used).

Preliminary technical and environmental studies for the initial route options identified were completed by October 1989. Concurrently, the public consultation process identified general public concerns as well as some that were route-specific. As a result of the consultation program, new route options or variations were identified. Additional environmental and technical studies required were completed by the fall of 1990 and results were shared with interested groups and individuals. (An overview of Phase 1 and 2 public consultation activity, is contained in a chronology in *Appendix D.*)

1.2 Scope of Work

The purpose of this report is to summarize the results of the public consultation for B.C. Hydro's proposed Kelly Lake to Cheekye 500 kV transmission line. Synergistics Consulting Limited of Vancouver was retained in May 1989 to assist Hydro's project planning process by undertaking a public consultation program which identified public issues and concerns and made recommendations. The public was defined to include government and elected officials, Hydro employees, native Bands, community, business and special interest groups, and all residents in the study area, as well as other interested individuals and groups outside the study area.

The consultation occurred in two phases: Phase 1 from May to November, 1989 and Phase 2 from mid-April to September 30, 1990. A third phase was initiated in October 1990. A summary of Phase 3 is included in *Addendum I.*

The public consultation process was hindered somewhat by Hydro's earlier proposal (in the late 1970s). At that time local residents identified a variety

of concerns with the proposed project. They were generally dissatisfied with this earlier consultation process, perceiving that it did not fully address their concerns.

For the current proposal, however, Hydro has extended the scope of the public consultation program by initiating it early in the project planning process and has demonstrated a willingness to consider a variety of potential routes and public concerns.

A significant limitation to the overall consultation process was the initial reluctance of several Bands, potentially affected by the project, to participate in project discussions. (Hydro's contacts with Bands and on-going consultation initiatives are discussed in a separate document.)

1.3 Consultation Goals and Objectives

The overall goal of the Kelly Lake-Cheekye public consultation program was to address potential issues and concerns identified by the public and to incorporate these into project planning. The objectives of the Phase 1 program (as developed by the consultant) were:

- to foster broad-based understanding of the need for the transmission line and the project planning process;
- to provide ongoing opportunities for residents in affected communities and B.C. Hydro to exchange information and views, and to report on project specific issues raised by the communities;
- to stimulate public discussion of alternate routes and provide opportunities for the public to assist in route selection; and,
- to demonstrate B.C. Hydro's commitment to respond to community concerns in an open and straight-forward manner.

Objectives for the second phase of consultation (as defined by B.C. Hydro in the terms of reference for the study, see *Appendix A*) are as follows:

- to report back to those communities, interest groups and individuals in the study area in order to inform them of the results of the first phase of consultation, illustrate how their input was applied to the project planning process, and obtain their views about the generally-favoured route;
- to continue consultations with the Municipal, Regional and Provincial Governments in the study area and aid in the effort to obtain agreement on appropriate siting of the line through Whistler and the Cheakamus Valley;
- to consult with the native Bands in the study area; and,

- to continue demonstrating B.C. Hydro's commitment to meaningful, open consultation with the public.

1.4 Report Organization

Chapter 2 describes the consultation process undertaken between May-November, 1989 and mid-April to September 30, 1990. The issues and concerns raised by the public on a community and stakeholder group basis are set out in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 analyses issues identified in the two phases of consultation. The consultant's conclusions and recommendations for future consultation activities are presented in Chapter 5.

Hydro's consultation with native Bands is outlined in a separate report titled Kelly Lake - Cheekye Native Consultation. Consultation activities that have occurred in Phase 3, since the end of September 1990 up to March 1991, are described in *Addendum I.*

B.C. Hydro's response to the issues and concerns identified through the consultation process is provided in a separate document.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Overview and Schedule

This chapter describes in chronological order the methods and schedule employed for the Kelly Lake-Cheekye public consultation program. Its contents are confined to a discussion of activities only; public response to these activities is described under "Findings" in Chapter 3. Since the public consultation process occurred in two phases up to the point of writing, these are described separately. The main activities of the third phase of consultation, that occurred from October 1, 1990 to February 28, are described in *Addendum I.*

B.C. Hydro's Kelly Lake-Cheekye Project Team was responsible for facilitating and coordinating all aspects of public consultation, in conjunction with external public consultation specialists, Synergistics Consulting Limited. Input and support for the process was sought from the Project Team (with representatives from Hydro's Environmental, Properties, Engineering, External Relations, Legal and other departments) under the direction of a Project Manager, as well as from other specialists such as Hydro's EMF (Electric and Magnetic Field Effects) Project Manager.

The consultant, working with the Project Team, developed a public consultation plan. The main steps in this plan were:

1) Complete consultation project planning and announce the project
2) Undertake one-to-one consultation
3) Prepare information materials
4) Consult with special interest groups and community organizations
5) Hold community open houses
6) Integrate public input into project planning
7) Maintain ongoing consultation.

A schedule highlighting the main activities in Phases 1 and 2 of the Kelly Lake-Cheekye consultation process is displayed in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 **Summary of Consultation** Phase 1

Activity	Date
Press release issued	June 13/89
Initial meetings held	
• Mayors and SLRD Chairman	May 17/89
• Squamish Council	June 13/89
• Clinton Council	June 20/89
• Lillooet Council	June 20/89
• Whistler Council	June 26/89
• SLRD Board	June 26/89
B.C. Hydro Employee meetings	
• Squamish	May 10/89
• Bridge River	May 17/89
• Kamloops	June 12/89
• Cache Creek	June 13/89
Community interviews conducted	June to July 1989
Toll-free telephone line established	June 1989
Public Information Request (PIR) system established	June 1989
Nine Information Centres established	July 1989
Update meeting with SLRD	September 25/89
Newsletters distributed	September /89
Open Houses held	
• Clinton	October 3/89
• Seton/ Shalalth	October 4/89
• Lillooet	October 5/89
• Seton Lake Band Office	October 10/89
• Pemberton	October 11/89
• Birken	October 12/89
• Squamish	October 13/89
• Whistler	October 14/89
Interest Group meetings held	
• Shalalth Chamber of Commerce	October 4/89
• Signal Hill Parents	October 12/89
• Whistler residents	October 14/89
• Yalakom residents	November 30/89

Table 2.1(cont'd) **Summary of Consultation** Phase 2

Activity	Date
Media advisory issued	May 1990
B.C. Hydro Employee meetings	
• Squamish District Office	June 4/90
• Cheekye Substation	June 5/90
• Cache Creek	June 11/90
• Lillooet	June 13/90
Telephone contact with interest groups	May 1990
Updates provided to Information Centres	June 1990
Public Information Request (PIR) system continues (270 requests answered by the end of Phase 2)	Ongoing
Toll-free telephone line continues	Ongoing
Project info sent to SLRD	May 1990
Newsletters distributed	May 1990
Open Houses held	
• Squamish	June 4/90
• Birken	June 5/90
• Whistler	June 6/90
• Pemberton	June 7/90
• Clinton	June 11/90
• Seton/ Shalalth	June 12/90
• Lillooet	June 13/90
Interest Group meetings held	
• North Van Outdoor School	June 4/90
• Lower Cheakamus residents	June 4/90
• Birken residents	June 6/90
• Whistler residents	June 7/90
• Signal Hill Parents	June 7/90
• Yalakom residents	August 13/90

2.2 *Phase One* Consultation - May to November 1989

Public Information Materials

The design of public information materials for the Kelly Lake–Cheekye project was initiated early in the process so that materials would be available prior to the first public forums. The materials developed were designed to meet the various information requirements of the diverse interest groups based on discussion, interviews, and assessment of their needs by the project team.

The various types of materials prepared are briefly described below. (Examples of these materials are included in *Appendix B*, except where noted otherwise.)

Press Release and Media Advisory - To notify the public about the project a press release was issued by B.C. Hydro in June 1989 when project studies were initiated. Copies were sent to local area, as well as Lower Mainland, newspapers (copy in *Appendix C*). The press releases contained information about the project need, general routing and studies underway. A media advisory, with a project newsletter attached, was sent to members of the press throughout the region.

Letters to MPs and MLAs - Letters were sent to all MPs and MLAs who represent the study area residents to inform them about the project and to offer to keep them updated on Hydro's activities.

Letters to Provincial Government Ministries - Letters were sent to the BC Ministries of Forests, Crown Lands, and Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources to inform them about the project and to respond to particular concerns of the agencies.

Project Newsletter - The Phase 1 project newsletter, in a four page newspaper format, contained information about the project history, the planning process, studies underway and routes being considered. It also included a toll-free telephone number and a mail-in coupon for those people interested in more details. Newsletters were mailed to every household in the region one to two weeks prior to the project Open Houses. Newsletters were also sent to Hydro Production and Customer Services' employees and Information Centres.

Route Maps - A color Xerox set of route maps included five sheets: the first showed all routes that were being considered; the second showed the subset of these where detailed environmental and engineering studies had been undertaken; and the final three maps repeated the contents of the second map at a larger scale. The route map set was sent to District Office and Production employees, Information Centres and anyone who specifically requested it.

Display Boards - Fifteen display boards (each 30" by 40") containing simple text and photographs or figures, were prepared to present basic project information at the project Open Houses. The boards addressed the following topics: the need for the project, project schedule, potential routes, technical and environmental studies, preliminary environmental findings, public issues, vegetation management and the energy project review process.

Other Information – At project Open Houses additional reference materials were available to the public including: a Project Perspectus; brochures about safety; Power Smart (conservation) programs; copies of the Cypress Consultants' report completed for the first Kelly Lake project; vegetation management brochures; EMF information sheets; the Corporate Business Plan; large scale route maps and other information.

Additional Methods of Communication - Phases 1 and 2

Information Centres – Early in the planning process a number of information centres were identified throughout the study area. These included libraries and government offices that agreed to make project-related information, such as reports, maps,and EMF information available to the public.

Toll-free telephone line - A toll-free telephone line was installed at B.C. Hydro's External Relations Department for the use of area residents when project planning was initiated. This line was staffed during office hours and connected to an answering machine at all other times.

Public Information Requests (PIRs) - In 1989, the External Relations Department in B.C. Hydro established a system for responding to phone and mail requests from the public for project-related inquiries or more general requests for information. To the end of September 1990, approximately 270 requests about the Kelly Lake–Cheekye project had been answered by letter or phone call. (A brief summary of these PIRs is included in *Appendix E.*)

Initial Meetings

To introduce the project to area residents, a series of initial meetings was held between B.C. Hydro Project Team representatives and the Chairman of the Squamish Lillooet Regional District and the mayors of Pemberton, Whistler and Squamish. This was followed by meetings with the Municipal Councils of Clinton, Lillooet, Squamish and Whistler. The purpose of these initial meetings, held in May and June 1989, was:

- to familiarize local officials with general project information and determine their initial concerns; and
- to allow these individuals to comment on the proposed consultation process.

Meetings were also held with B.C. Hydro Customer Services and Production employees in the study area at Squamish, Bridge River, and Lillooet, and outside the study area in Cache Creek and Kamloops. The purpose of these meetings, held in May and June 1989, was to familiarize employees with the project, to review the consultation plan, and to prepare local staff to be able to answer queries from customers about the project, or to know who to refer customers to for more information.

In general, these meetings with local government and employees were very informative. Municipal representatives were helpful in highlighting possible areas of concern, types of impacts that could be given priority by residents and suggestions for mitigation/compensation strategies. Employees pointed out areas where they felt there might be some opposition to the proposed project.

Community Interviews

The main purpose of the community interviews was to provide the Project Team with an initial indication of attitudes toward recent local area planning and development issues as well as toward the proposed Kelly Lake-Cheekye project. It was felt that this information would be useful in preparing the Project Team to respond to particular sensitivities or concerns specific to each study area community.

Two methods of data collection were used. First, non-reactive or secondary sources of information (planning documents, newspaper articles, reports and so on) were reviewed and analyzed for information about community issues, active organizations and leaders, and attitudes towards the Kelly Lake-Cheekye project. Secondly, about 70 local people were interviewed in person or by telephone. People selected for interviews were key opinion leaders (not necessarily elected officials) in their communities, perhaps associated with special interest groups and actively involved in local issues.

The selection of those to be interviewed was developed based on recommendations from local people knowledgeable about the community (such as community planners). The intention was to include a cross-section of residents and was not necessarily to include every community leader.

Limitations of the interview methodology should be noted here. Perhaps most important is the subjectivity and qualitative nature of the information. There was no attempt to define a statistically random sample of people to be interviewed and therefore it could be said that the opinions expressed by these local residents are not representative of the views of the wider population. Nevertheless, the interviews did identify the views of some residents who initiate 'grass roots' level awareness and action on local issues.

Special Meetings

B.C. Hydro's Project Team representatives made a concerted effort throughout the first phase of the consultation process to meet with any individual or group in the study area who expressed interest in the proposed project. Hydro adopted this pro-active approach to ensure that area residents had as many opportunities as possible to ask questions, voice concerns, and receive information from Hydro. It should be noted that property owners were not included among key stakeholder groups in the first two phases of the consultation program, since the routing had not been narrowed sufficiently at that time.

Squamish-Lillooet Regional District - In addition to initial meetings held in May and June 1989 with the Squamish-Lillooet Regional District Board and three mayors, an update meeting was convened in late September 1989 for the Project Team to make a presentation to the SLRD Board. The purpose of the presentation was threefold:

- to update the Board on the status of project planning;
- to discuss the SLRD's suggestion concerning the formation of an advisory committee for the project; and
- to present information on electric and magnetic field effects.

Interest Groups - During July and August 1989, Hydro offered to discuss the project and related concerns with several interest groups in the affected communities. Three groups (Pemberton Merchants Association, Pemberton Parent-Teacher Association, and Cheakamus Valley residents) expressed an interest in this opportunity but subsequently decided that the project Open Houses would provide them with the information they needed.

While the Open Houses were being held in the study area, project members again contacted several groups and individuals who had expressed an interest in the project, to let them know that Hydro representatives were available for extra meetings, in addition to the Open Houses. Meetings were held in Whistler with members of the business community and in Pemberton with representatives of the Pemberton Parent-Teacher Association. B.C. Hydro representatives also responded to a request for a meeting with residents of Yalakom Valley/Antoine Creek Valley, west of Lillooet. This meeting was held in November, 1989. Ongoing offers to meet were made by B.C. Hydro.

Provincial Government Ministries - B.C. Hydro met in November 1989 with representatives of several provincial agencies including the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources, Ministry of Parks, Ministry of Environment, and the Ministry of Regional Development. The purpose of these meetings was for Hydro to present information about the various routing options. A record of contacts with government agency staff is included in each environmental consultant's report.

Open Houses

The final component of the first phase of public consultation activities was a series of Open Houses held in the first two weeks of October, 1989. A total of seven Open Houses were held in Squamish, Birken, Whistler, Pemberton, Clinton, Seton/Shalalth and Lillooet. An additional Open House was held for the Seton Lake Indian Band. They were advertised in local and regional papers prior to the events, at B.C. Hydro District offices, Project Information Centres (see *Appendix B*) and in a project newsletter insert distributed to every household in the study region.

The information shown at the Open Houses was intended to be general. Display boards presented basic project information including: project need, schedule, studies underway, route maps, environmental impacts, major public concerns, and the government review process. Large scale photos and maps portrayed the route options along the length of the corridor. Attendees were encouraged to look at these displays and to take with them any of the literature (brochures, info sheets, small maps etc.) available. In addition, Hydro resource people were available to answer specific questions. Hours of operation were 3:00 P.M. to 9:00 P.M., except in Whistler where the Open House started at 2:00 P.M. to allow a pre-meeting discussion with a number of Whistler residents.

2.3 *Phase Two* Consultation - April to September 1990

Information Materials

The public information materials produced for Phase 2 consultations were based on previous publications as well as on new reports highlighting the environmental, technical and public consultation up to May 1990 (Preliminary Planning Report) and a transmission line system planning report (Planning Perspective). The materials are briefly described below, followed by a summary of their distribution (Copies of materials are included in *Appendix B.*)

Letters to those on the Mailing List - A letter was sent to every individual on the project mailing list to update them on project planning.

Project Newsletter - The second project newsletter, presented in a four-page 8 1/2" x 11" newspaper format, contained the following: a description of the process by which the generally-favoured route had been identified; a description of areas where no route consensus had been identified; a comparison of route options; a summary of issues raised at Open Houses held in October; and, an outline of the steps ahead.

Kelly Lake to Cheekye; A Planning Perspective - This report, completed in March, 1990, outlines B.C. Hydro's planning process for major transmission line projects and explains how that process led to detailed studies and rationale for the Kelly Lake - Cheekye line.

Kelly Lake-Cheekye Substation Second 500 kV Transmission Line; Preliminary Planning Report - This document, published in May, 1990, summarizes the results of Phase 1 environmental and technical studies and consultation activities for the Kelly Lake-Cheekye project. This report concluded that the opinions of the environmental consultants and the public to date, supported the use of the generally favoured route, except in Whistler, the Lower Cheakamus Valley and through Indian Reserves, where no agreements on routing had been reached.

Project Information Sheets - A series of information sheets about specific subject areas was made available by request. EMF information sheets and others were available at meetings and Open Houses.

Route Maps - A colour Xerox route map, showing all routes under consideration at the beginning of Phase 2, was made available.

Aerial Photos and Large Scale Photos - Both aerial and large scale photos taken along the length of the proposed routes were displayed at the Open Houses.

Display Boards - Display boards for the Open Houses contained similar information to those used in the Phase 1 Open Houses; namely, the need for the project schedule, the results of environmental and technical studies, vegetation management, the energy project review process and other topics. In addition there were several sets of boards (a map on one and text on the other) that compared route options in more detail.

Project Video - A 20-minute video was prepared describing the project and the generally favoured route. Several shorter clips highlighted sections of the route options. These videos were shown to Hydro employees and were also shown during Open Houses.

Other Information - Additional reference materials from the B.C. Hydro Information Centre were made available to the public at the Open Houses. These included brochures about Power Smart Programs, vegetation management, safety, environmental principles and corporate information.

The distribution of these materials during the second phase of public consultation proceeded in the following manner:

Media advisory - Media in the study area received, in mid-May, a project update and the schedule for the upcoming Open Houses.

Information Centres and Hydro District Offices - Nine designated information centres and relevant Hydro District Offices received an information package in late May including several copies of the project Planning Perspective, Preliminary Planning Report, newsletters and posters advertising the Open Houses.

Letters to Municipal Councils, interest groups, MPs and MLAs - These letters included information about upcoming Open Houses and extended an invitation to meet with B.C. Hydro if desired. (Copies of letters are included in *Appendix E*).

Letters to Provincial Government Ministries - Letters were sent to various ministries to update them about the proposed project and to respond to particular queries.

Information package to Regional District - The Squamish-Lillooet Regional District received several copies of the newsletters, Planning Perspective and Preliminary Planning Report. (See *Appendix B*).

Mailouts to households - Every household in the study area received a letter updating them on the project in January and received a copy of the second newsletter in late May.

Meetings and Open Houses - At these meetings, the public had access to the full range of information materials described above.

Additional Meetings

A stated objective of Phase 2 consultation was to maintain contact with those individuals, groups and local governments who had demonstrated an interest in or concern with the proposed project during Phase 1. Initial contact was made by a letter which indicated B.C. Hydro's willingness to meet and discuss project-related concerns. (See *Appendix E* for a copy of this letter). These letters were followed up by phone calls to the Regional District and to several groups and individuals.

Squamish-Lillooet Regional District - The Squamish-Lillooet Regional District declined the offer from Hydro to hold a project workshop. The Board had recently appointed an eight member Advisory Group, composed of representatives from the entire study area, to function as advisors to the Board on matters related to the proposed Kelly Lake–Cheekye project. The exact terms of reference for the group had not yet been finalized by the SLRD. The first meeting of the group was scheduled for late October 1990. The SLRD provided its members, as well as members of the Advisory Group, with copies of an information package (including the Planning Perspective and the Preliminary Planning Report) and B.C. Hydro gave a detailed environmental, technical and public consultation project presentation at that time.

Interest Groups and Property Owners - Telephone contact was made during the last two weeks of May, 1990 with every interest group that had expressed specific concerns about the project earlier in the planning process.(The list of groups contacted is included in *Appendix B.*) Representatives from most of the groups did not feel that they needed meetings with B.C. Hydro, in addition to the Open Houses.

The viewpoints of the regional environmental groups, including the Federation of B.C. Mountain Clubs, the B.C. Wildlife Federation, the Outdoor Recreation Council of B.C., and the Federation of B.C. Naturalists, are represented in Table 3.2. These groups were not interested in meetings with Hydro at that time, but wished to be kept informed about the project. They were added to the project mailing list. The three groups that did request special meetings included: the North Vancouver Outdoor School; the Cheakamus residents; and the Signal Hill School (Pemberton) Parents Group. Several property owners also wished to discuss specific concerns or suggestions for alternative routing. Hydro Project Team members met with each of these groups in the first two weeks of June, 1990. A summary of the key issues arising in each meeting is included in Chapter 3.

Employees - During the weeks of the Open Houses, a representative from B.C. Hydro's External Relations Department met with District Office Production and Customer Service personnel in the following locations: Squamish; Cheekye Substation; Lillooet and Cache Creek. (Employees from Shalalth and Bridge River decided to attend the local Open House rather than an additional meeting). The purpose of these meetings was to update the employees, answer specific project-related questions and show the recently completed Kelly Lake-Cheekye video. Employees also reviewed the level of public interest and local concerns about the project. Project team members were able to brief Hydro employees with up-to-date information so that local offices could better respond to public inquiries.

Open Houses

A total of seven Open Houses were held during the first two weeks of June 1990 in the following communities: Squamish, Birken, Whistler, Pemberton, Clinton, Seton/Shalalth, and Lillooet. The dates and locations of the Open Houses were advertised well in advance of the events in study area newspapers and at Hydro District offices. The format was similar to that of the first series of Open Houses; that is, the public was free to peruse the display boards and maps, and to discuss concerns and issues with the Hydro Project Team representatives present. Some changes were made in organization, based on the experience gained after the first round of Open Houses. Hours of operation were reduced to 4:00 to 8:00 PM. Two locations were changed to more central or easily accessible places. Also, attendees were encouraged at the entrance to put their names and addresses on a sign-in sheet which was used to record attendance and to ensure an accurate and current mailing list.

Attendees were given a project information package which included the second project newsletter, EMF info sheet, and other information. On their way out they were asked to complete an exit survey (see *Appendix B* for a copy of this) which asked questions about routing and more general concerns. The comments from the exit surveys are reviewed in Chapter 3 of this report. In order to encourage the highest possible response rate for completed exit surveys, Hydro advertised that a draw would be held from all exit surveys. The first prize was a home energy audit and the second prize was a programmable thermostat. The draw was completed in early July and the two study area residents were notified of their prizes.

Project Team representatives also recorded attendees' concerns on separate comment forms; then, shared their perceptions about the events of each Open House in a debriefing session afterward. The debriefing sessions provided the Project Team representatives with a chance to discuss the key issues at each Open House and to share input received. The results of these informal debriefing sessions are included in Chapter 3.

3.0 FINDINGS

3.1 Introduction

This chapter contains two sections. The first briefly summarizes the response to the Open Houses held during both Phase 1 and 2 throughout the study area. The second section lists those issues and concerns identified by area residents at the Open Houses and meetings during both phases of consultation. Issues are described on a community and stakeholder group basis.

It must be emphasized that the opinions of native Bands about the proposed Kelly Lake–Cheekye project are not included in this section of the report, though discussions between the Bands and Hydro were proceeding. For a discussion of Hydro's consultations with Indian Bands see the separate document on Native Consultation.

The sources of information for this chapter (referred to in more detail in Chapter 2 above) include: Open House exit surveys; comments recorded at Open Houses by Project Team members; meeting notes; and letters. During the first phase about 300-350 people were consulted (about 70 people were interviewed in person or by telephone and 297 people attended open houses). However, it should be noted that the second phase of consultation was based on contacts with a more limited number (about 220 including Hydro employees) who participated in meetings and Open Houses. While these results must be interpreted bearing this in mind (ie. that the number of people who provided input to the consultation process represents a small percentage of the regional population) it is also important to note that Phase 2 consultation was targeted at those groups and individuals whose concerns had been identified during Phase 1. In other words, those groups or individuals who had concerns became a focus during the second phase (although those "new" to the process were given equal consideration).

3.2 Response to Open Houses

Phase 1

Based on the level of attendance at the Phase 1 Open Houses (see Table 3.1), interest in the project seemed to be most pronounced in Squamish, Birken, Pemberton and Lillooet. In Birken for example some 40% of the local area population attended; many of those residents have been involved with the project since it was first proposed in the late 1970s. However overall attendance was, on average, lower than anticipated with a total of 297 persons for all eight Open Houses. The reasons for limited interest by some of the communities seems obvious, though it cannot be proven. Clinton is located north of the Kelly Lake Substation and would experience few direct impacts. The Seton Lake Band, which also had an Open House, initially voiced few outstanding concerns, other than the future of the Highline Road,

but wanted to discuss a package of issues, including historical grievances, with Hydro. These issues were later raised in negotiations with B. C. Hydro as reported in the Native Consultation document. Whistler was an anomaly in that few people attended, despite the fact that the Open House was held on a Saturday, when one would expect the largely weekend population to be there. Perhaps since the ski season had not started, few of these weekend residents were in town. Reasons for the low attendance overall were not clear but should not be interpreted as a lack of interest by the public, especially since the project was in the early stages of planning.

A total of 66 exit surveys were completed by study area residents who attended the first series of Open Houses. Although the degree of detail provided by these surveys was limited, general concerns identified were similar for all communities and included: EMF effects, environmental and visual impacts, vegetation management, native issues, and the public consultation process associated with the proposed project. The general consensus regarding routing was to follow the existing transmission corridor. A summary of the exit surveys for Phase 1 is included in *Appendix B*.

Table 3.1

Attendance at Project Open Houses

	Phase 1	*Phase 2*
Clinton	29	7
Seton/Shalalth	26	19
Seton Lake Band	15	*
Lillooet	56	11
Pemberton	29	41
Birken	52	32
Whistler	27	30
Squamish	63	56
Total attendance	297	196

* No Phase 2 Open House

Phase 2

Total attendance at the Open Houses during the second phase of consultation (displayed in Table 3.1) was considerably lower (about 100 persons fewer) than total attendance at the Phase 1 Open Houses. The very low numbers for Clinton and Lillooet may be due to the fact that the proposed project would have very limited impact on these communities.

The relatively high figures for Pemberton and Squamish attest to a high level of interest in routing in and around these communities. Attendance at Whistler was once again surprisingly low; there seemed to be very limited local interest in the proposed project. The reasons for the relatively low attendance overall are not clear. During the Phase 1 Open Houses, some study area residents stated that Hydro should not interpret the low attendance to mean a lack of interest in or an unquestioning acceptance of the proposed new transmission line, especially when the project was in the early planning stage.

A total of 87 exit surveys were completed after the Phase 2 Open Houses, as compared to 66 surveys after Phase 1. Once again, the main issues identified by area residents were: EMF effects, environmental impacts, and visual effects. Property issues (that is, effects on property values, land use, lifestyle) were also important. The majority of those people that completed the exit surveys expressed a preference for the "generally favoured" route and for the High Cheakamus route. A few individuals stated a preference for the Duffey route option and other alternatives such as Birkenhead, Rainbow and Hurley. Summary results of the Phase 2 exit surveys are included in *Appendix B*.

3.3 Findings by Community and Stakeholder Group

A summary of major positions by stakeholder groups is displayed in Table 3.2. The findings that follow are listed randomly.

Table 3.2 **Major Positions by Stakeholder Groups** Phase 1 & 2

Regional District and Municipal Councils

1. Squamish-Lillooet Regional District
   - *supports the use of the existing transmission corridor*
2. Clinton Council
   - *interest in potential economic opportunities*
3. Lillooet Council
   - *opposed to use of Duffey Lake route to preserve scenic qualities and tourism opportunities*
   - *supports use of existing corridor*
4. Pemberton Council
   - *concerned about need for the transmission line*
   - *wants existing and new lines routed out of Village*
5. Resort Municipality of Whistler Council
   - *no routing preference stated*
   - *wants Hydro to minimize visual impacts*
6. Squamish Council
   - *supports High Cheakamus route*

Study Area Interest Groups

1. Yalakom Residents
   - *opposed to Bridge and Antoine routes due to lifestyle impacts, wildlife and visual concerns*
   - *support the use of the existing transmission corridor*
2. Signal Hill Parents Group
   - *concerned about EMF effects and routing through Pemberton Valley*
3. Pemberton Sportsmens' Wildlife Association
   - *supports use of existing transmission corridor*
4. Birkenhead Estates
   - *opposed to use of Ryan, Birkenhead and Owl routes*
5. North Vancouver Outdoor School
   - *opposed to use of existing right-of-way*
6. Cheakamus Residents
   - *opposed to use of existing right-of-way; support High Cheakamus route*

Regional Environmental Groups

1. Outdoor Recreation Council of B.C.
   - *supports the use of existing transmission corridor*
2. Federation of Mountain Clubs of B.C.
   - *supports the use of existing transmission corridor*
3. B.C.Wildlife Federation
   - *supports the use of existing transmission corridor*
4. Federation of B.C. Naturalists
   - *supports the use of existing transmission corridor*

Squamish-Lillooet Regional District

Phase 1

The Squamish-Lillooet Regional District includes all of the study area communities except Clinton, which lies within the boundaries of the Thompson-Nicola Regional District. General issues raised at meetings by members of the SLRD Board during Phase 1 included:

- concern about the potential effects on human health of electric and magnetic fields, especially the possible cumulative effects from several lines and the implication of replacement of a 230 kV line by a 500 kV line;
- a conviction by some Board members that the economic benefits of electricity for export are outweighed by environmental and social costs;
- a preference for vegetation management methods that minimize or eliminate the use of herbicides;
- a desire for a more equitable distribution of costs and benefits associated with energy developments (i.e.,most people in urban centres who benefit from electricity do not incur the impacts of high voltage transmission lines nearby);
- a suggestion that communities affected by transmission line projects be awarded a tax or grant in lieu;
- a concern about whether visual impact analysis was being conducted, especially around Whistler;
- a unanimous preference for the use of the existing corridor, if the project is built, rather than routing through relatively undisturbed landscapes such as Duffey Lake, the Soo Valley and Callaghan Creek. At the same time, some Board members felt that Birkenhead/Anderson Lake residents have had to bear the impacts of too many lines;
- considerable opposition expressed to the Duffey Lake route, because of potential visual impacts on an area intended for tourism development;
- concern that putting this new line through untouched areas compounds the problem for tourism and recreation resources;
- concern over perceived poor maintenance practices on the transmission line rights-of-way in the past, i.e. between Lillooet and Lytton; and,

- would like the option of bringing power to Vancouver through the Fraser Canyon investigated.

Phase 2

As described in section 2.3, the Squamish Lillooet Regional District declined the offer from B.C. Hydro in the Phase 2 consultation process for an overview presentation of the results and recommendations of the first phase of studies and consultation. At the time of writing this report, Hydro and the Regional District were defining the involvement of the recently formed SLRD Advisory Group which will provide community opinion related to the Kelly Lake–Cheekye project to the Regional District Board.

Clinton

Clinton Council members identified the following concerns in a meeting with Hydro representatives in June 1989:

- interested in the required width of rights-of-way;
- prefer no new access roads;
- concerned about the impact of EMFs on human health and wildlife (i.e. cumulative effects of lines, strength of effect/distance from line);
- interested in social impacts during construction, i.e. crew size, duration of work, crew accommodation, increased road traffic;
- interested in local employment opportunities;
- concerned about Hat Creek development and implications for the export of power;
- concerned about the effects of this transmission line on tourism;
- feel environmental concerns have changed radically over the last decade; and,
- feel that local people are interested in the project.

Clinton residents identified the following points associated with the proposed transmission line in the Open Houses:

Phase 1

- the hope that the project would create local economic benefits (such as clearing and construction jobs) that would help remedy

the high unemployment rate and bolster, even if temporarily, the local economy;

- potential risks to human health from EMF effects and, equally as important, from herbicides used in right-of-way maintenance;
- the view that Clinton would receive no direct benefits from the project (with the possible exception of some temporary jobs) but would incur only the costs (such as lost timber values); and,
- a need to clean up the existing right-of-way to protect cattle from injuries.

Phase 2

- concern by a property owner living within 20 meters of the Kelly Lake-Nicola transmission corridor about EMF effects; and,
- desire to be kept informed about possible logging contracts during clearing for the proposed new line.

Lillooet

Lillooet Council members identified the following issues in a meeting with Hydro representatives in June 1989:

- question whether Hydro would be using the Anderson Lake corridor;
- preference that the existing corridor be used and Duffey Lake be avoided;
- concern about the private (independent power producer) proposal for Meager Creek and whether it would require a new transmission line;
- preference that ecological principles are reflected in clearing practices; and,
- feel people in this area have to bear an inordinate share of the negative impacts of utility corridors.

Lillooet residents expressed the following project-related concerns in the Open Houses:

Phase 1

- a desire to protect the scenic qualities of the Duffey Lake Road for tourism by keeping any new transmission lines in the existing corridor;

- the need to protect wilderness areas should be balanced by potential visual impacts on settled areas (i.e., lines shouldn't come too close to the Village of Lillooet);
- potential risks to human health from electric and magnetic field effects and herbicides;
- the hope that area residents would receive some economic benefits from the project, including a guarantee that logging of the ROW would be contracted to local residents;
- suggestions that B.C. Hydro should curb increasing demands for electricity by developing more conservation programs and by increasing rates;
- support for the concept of ROW vegetation management by means of tree farms and edible berries, thereby eliminating the use of herbicides;
- assurances sought by one resident that Hydro would clean up felled timber in the ROW to prevent what was perceived to be a factor in past outbreaks of spruce budworm infestations;
- foregone agricultural potential of land crossed by transmission lines; and,
- a desire to see Hydro return to a perceived more visible role in terms of organizing and participating in community affairs.

Phase 2

- the desire to see an environmental protection plan put in place for ROW management to reduce problems such as erosion;
- support for the use of the existing corridor in order to preserve wilderness areas;
- interest in up-to-date information about EMFs; and,
- a recommendation that use of existing corridors and consolidation of lines was desirable from a safety perspective when flying planes or helicopters.

Yalakom Residents

Phase 1

About 50 people live in a community based in Moha in the Yalakom Valley, and in the Antoine Creek Valley, west of Lillooet. These people have located in this remote area to develop a self-sufficient lifestyle well removed from

any development. Some of these residents attended the Lillooet Open House to register their adamant opposition to the Antoine route option and to request Hydro to meet with them in their community. In late November 1989, three Hydro Project Team representatives travelled to Moha to hear the views of 36 area residents. The consensus of the Moha and Antoine community was unqualified opposition to the routing option through the Antoine Creek Valley, and more generally, to the proposed project. People at the meeting stated their intention to fight the project if the Antoine Creek route was selected. They want to maintain the isolation of the area and protect it from any development. They questioned the need for the project and the potential for health effects from herbicides and EMFs. They wanted to encourage B. C. Hydro to negotiate with the native Bands that could be affected by the project and reach agreement on the route through the Bridge River Reserve.

Phase 2

Although members of the Yalakom society were contacted on two occasions about the Phase 2 Open House in Lillooet, no members from this key group attended as they had previously stated their opposition to new transmission lines in their area and were unaware that new routes in their area were being reviewed by B.C. Hydro. Since Hydro was now actively considering transmission line routes that crossed the Antoine Creek Valley as alternatives to routing through Indian Reserves, Project Team members felt that it was critical to arrange a meeting with members of the group as soon as possible. In the meeting held in mid-August 1990 group members reiterated to B.C. Hydro representatives their absolute opposition to any transmission line through these valleys. They want B.C. Hydro to take the time necessary to deal with retroactive grievances in order to reach agreements with Bands, even if it jeopardizes the project schedule. They expressed many concerns including: potential EMF effects; potential impacts of a transmission line on critical mountain goat and sheep habitat; general impacts on wilderness areas; the need for a public inquiry into B.C. Hydro's mandate; and, the need for all developers to account for project impacts on quality of life and environmental quality. Members of the community stated their preference for small scale local electricity generation as opposed to mega-projects like Site C. They are supportive of Hydro's efforts to educate the public and support conservation programs such as Power Smart.

Seton/Shalalth

Non native residents of the Seton Portage/Shalalth area voiced the following opinions in the Open Houses:

Phase 1

- a desire to see B.C. Hydro contribute further to the upgrading and maintenance of the Highline Road which links Seton/Shalalth to

Pemberton (to now local residents have improved sections of the road with voluntary labour and financial donations);

- Hydro should consider compensating small rural communities that bear the costs of transmission line development, for example, by means of economic development assistance;
- some residents feel that compensation in the form of tourism development could be assisted in Seton/Shalalth if B.C. Hydro would implement its plans to develop a recreation site on Seton Lake;
- the possibility of utilizing the ROW for Christmas tree farms or other commercial horticultural ventures to provide some local employment; and,
- the hope that the proposed project would bring new residents to the community.

Phase 2

- the existing corridor is clearly the preferred routing;
- queries about EMF effects on arthritis and other health problems;
- environmental preservation and protection are high priorities; and,
- local people are very hopeful that project construction would result in the upgrading of the Highline Road and that its permanent maintenance would be taken over by the Provincial government.

B.C. Hydro Bridge River Production Employees

Employees raised the following points in a meeting with Project Team representatives in May 1989:

- perceive native issues to be similar to those raised last time as many issues were not resolved;
- feel Bands should be approached at the local level;
- feel early issues expressed in 1980 still remain, i.e., opposition from Whistler and native Bands, EMFs, system plan and the implications for export of electricity;
- interest expressed regarding local employment opportunities;
- interested in possibilities of upgrading the Highline Road; and,

- feel the public consultation process was deficient last time because: the EMF issue was not addressed; justification was not adequate and, generally there was not enough information provided.

Seton Lake Indian Band

The Seton Lake Band was the only one that responded to Hydro's offer to hold Open Houses specifically for native communities. The Band wanted to discuss a package of issues with Hydro at a future date but did identify the following concerns related to the proposed project:

Phase 1

- a desire to discuss specific resource issues and impacts with Hydro's environmental consultants;
- new ROW development will further expose traditional land uses (eg. hunting, wood cutting) to intrusion by non-natives;
- a need to counter what Band members perceive as the short-term perspective of the local Chamber of Commerce with a long-term plan to deal with general development pressure in the region;
- support for improvement and year-round maintenance of the Highline Road, provided this was not done until the Band had completed its development plan; and,
- support for the removal of 2L1 from their Reserves.

Phase 2

The Seton Lake Band decided against holding a Phase 2 Open House but pursued discussions with B.C.Hydro under the leadership of the Lillooet Tribal Council (as did the Bridge River, Cayoose Creek, Lillooet, Fountain and Pavilion Bands).

Pemberton

Pemberton residents identified the following project-related issues in the Open Houses:

Phase 1

- a need for B.C. Hydro to clarify the issue of electricity export and specifically whether the proposed Kelly Lake-Cheekye line would transmit electricity for export;
- queries about justification for the project and suggestions that Hydro should discourage escalating power consumption by promoting more conservation;

- potential risks to farm animal and human health (especially children) from EMFs and herbicides and an associated desire to remove existing transmission lines near the local elementary school;

- agricultural potential restricted by transmission line development and increased difficulty of farming around towers, balanced against some advantage for cattle grazing on the ROW;

- some skepticism about Hydro's public consultation process; that is, a view that Hydro has already selected a preferred route;

- the opinion that the relatively low attendance at the Pemberton Open House did not reflect public approval of the project;

- concern over the safety and monitoring of PCB storage at Creekside Substation;

- members of the Mount Currie Band registered a concern that traditional activities (hunting and gathering) would be detrimentally affected by another transmission line; and,

- potential negative impacts for tourism activities.

Phase 2

- the desire expressed by the majority of attendees to move the existing lines (and possibly the substation) from the middle of the Village to the outskirts of town to free up valuable developable land now and for the future;

- the perception that environmental preservation is a very important concern so that lines should be consolidated and kept out of pristine areas;

- the need to reduce the visual and potential EMF effects of any new line;

- the need to plan for future electricity demand by building a line that can carry additional power if it becomes necessary; and,

- the view that the public consultation process now in place is a significant improvement over 1982-83; that Hydro representatives were well-informed and provided good answers and visual information.

Signal Hill Parents Group

Phases 1 and 2

The Signal Hill Elementary School in Pemberton is located close to two 230 kV lines; the 2L1 line may be removed if the new Kelly Lake–Cheekye line is built but the 2L2 line (closest to the school) will remain. Several concerned individuals from the Parents Group met with Hydro representatives during the first round of public consultation to ask questions about EMF effects and other issues, including the possibility of removing all lines from the area adjacent to the school. The group met once more with B.C. Hydro in June 1990 to register its opposition to the proposed routing through Pemberton and to confirm its desire to have Hydro relocate 2L2 away from the school. The parents feel that alternate routes well away from the community (eg. Ryan) should be considered, in view of their perception that health risks, especially for children, may be associated with EMFs. Measurements were taken of the EMFs at the school by B.C. Hydro and these results were shared with the parents. The results showed that magnetic fields are elevated but they are well within guidelines established for edge of right–of–way magnetic fields in other jurisdictions, such as New York State.

Birken

Birken residents expressed the following concerns in the Open Houses:

Phase 1

- a high level of concern by some residents about the potential health effects of EMFs and dissatisfaction with B.C. Hydro as the source of information about the issue;
- support for the replacement of 2L1, especially if the proposed line could be relocated in places to reduce visual impacts;
- some opposition to the predominant view that the Duffey Route is not an acceptable option;
- communities along the existing ROW have borne the impacts of too many lines;
- concerns about perceived negative effects of existing and proposed lines on property values and on visual resources;
- desire to be fairly compensated for timber values that could be lost through new ROW clearing;
- opposition to electricity generation and transmission for export; and,

- a feeling that B.C. Hydro has not responded adequately to local concerns about safe storage of PCBs at Creekside (though this is not directly related to the Kelly Lake-Cheekye project).

Phase 2

- possibility of re-aligning the new line through the valley, moving it higher up to Seven and Eight Mile Ridges, to reduce visual impact;
- the opinion that the Duffey and Hurley routes should be reconsidered because they are environmentally acceptable, even though they are apparently not "politically" acceptable;
- the Valley has borne the adverse effects (perceived decreased property values, detrimental visual impacts) of too many lines;
- concern that the new line should be placed well away from the prime land because of the limited amount of developable land in the Valley;
- that Hydro should address past poor clearing and construction practices;
- the construction of the Kelly Lake-Cheekye line could make Gates-Birken the preferred route for future lines;
- the community should be compensated for the inconvenience it has had to accept (Hydro could finance a community hall);
- support for Hydro's proposed alignment of the line and the release of 2L1 right-of-way;
- concern about EMF effects at a number of specific locations;
- skepticism about the entire consultation process ("it's just a public relations exercise," "a smoke screen") and whether public input would make any difference; and,
- observation that Hydro has been more open in its communications than it has in the past.

Tour with Local Residents

To investigate the option suggested by some local residents of moving the proposed route for the new line further up the hillside, three Hydro Project Team members met with four residents, the day after the Phase 2 Open House, to drive the length of the valley. After looking at Hydro's proposed alignment two of the four residents agreed that B.C. Hydro's original routing was the better alternative from a visual perspective. The Hydro

representatives pointed out that selective clearing would also contribute to reducing visual impact.

Whistler

Whistler Council members identified the following issues in meeting with Hydro representatives in June 1989:

- residents feel they have had to bear the brunt of too many lines already; and,
- preference that the existing corridor be used rather than impacting on relatively undisturbed landscapes such as the Soo Valley and Callaghan Creek.

Residents of Whistler voiced concern about the following potential impacts of the proposed project during the Open Houses:

Phase 1

- visual impacts of another transmission line both on local residents and tourism, especially as Whistler has been developed as a resort town valued for its scenic setting (there was little understanding that the project would be replacing an existing line through Whistler with opportunities to reduce impacts on the visual landscape) ;
- potential health effects from EMFs and herbicides used for ROW maintenance;
- similar to other communities, issues of project justification, electricity export and Hydro's commitment to conservation programs;
- no direct benefits for local areas that bear the costs of energy project development; and,
- the implications of a Meager Creek development or other independent power developments for the Kelly Lake–Cheekye line.

Phase 2

- the need to reduce visual impacts on residential, tourism and recreational developments, including those at Pinecrest and Black Tusk Village;
- the use of the Whistler bypass (Rainbow-Soo routes) to remove lines from populated areas and free up very valuable land for real estate development;
- support for further investigation of the "High Cheakamus" route;

- the need to protect existing wilderness for growing recreational demands (ie. keep the new line in the existing corridor);
- consolidate lines wherever possible to reduce visual clutter;
- adverse effect on property value;
- potential health effects from EMFs, especially with multiple transmission lines;
- support for the consultation process ("better than last time"), as long as public concerns are acted upon; and,
- a concern that building the new line in the 2L1 ROW would have negative impacts on a developing wetlands park between Green and Alta Lakes, and on the River of Golden Dreams. There is already a wetlands reserve at the south end of the river and two private developers who hold land along the river may donate land to extend the reserve.

Discussions with the Resort Municipality of Whistler (RMOW)

Phase 2

In an attempt to inform the Resort Municipality of Whistler Council and staff of the options available in the Whistler area and to obtain their comments on these options, members of the Project Team met in January 1990 with the Advisory Planning Commission and Advisory Parks and Recreation Commission. An overview and update of the project and a summary of the two route options available in the Whistler area (i.e. through Whistler using the 2L1 ROW with some improvements to reduce visibility or around Whistler via the Soo-Rainbow option) was provided. Further information and materials were subsequently supplied. A March 1990 RMOW Council resolution identified a number of items Council wanted Hydro to consider if the 2L1 ROW was used through Whistler. These items included the following:

- alternate tower designs and narrower rights-of-way;
- relocation of hydro corridors away from Green Lake;
- relocation of two hydro corridors to the west of Alta Lake Road above the bench to be adjacent to the existing corridor;
- relocation of two hydro lines from Function Junction to Brandywine Falls; and,
- relocation underground of all overhead wiring adjacent to Highway 99 from Bayshore to Emerald Estates.

Subsequent to this, a meeting was held in late May between the Mayor of Whistler and the Chairman of B.C. Hydro and a letter was then sent from the Project Manager to the Mayor outlining B.C. Hydro's position and understanding that the RMOW would re-consider its position.

In early August 1990, B.C. Hydro's Project Manager and Environmental Coordinator met with the RMOW Administrator and the Director of Planning to further explore the issue. A helicopter survey of the routing options both through and around the RMOW formed part of that meeting. Hydro's response to each of five above- cited items was described and confirmed in a subsequent letter from the Project Manager. It is understood that the RMOW will be retaining an independent consultant to provide advice related to the proposed project.

Meeting with Property Owner

Phase 2

While in the Whistler area, Hydro Team members visited a property owner south-west of town, to consider his request for realignment. As a result of discussions with this individual and his neighbour and a site tour of the affected properties, Hydro agreed to investigate a new routing option that would use the existing 2L1 ROW north of Function Junction.

Squamish

Squamish Council members voiced the following opinions in a meeting with Hydro representatives in June 1989:

- interested in the visual impacts of the line and the viability of undergrounding lines; and,
- anticipate that Squamish would miss most of the direct impacts but that other areas will oppose the Duffey, Soo and Callaghan route options.

A second meeting was held with the Squamish Council in August 1989. The main focus of this meeting was to provide information about independent power producers (IPPs), but there was some discussion regarding the Kelly Lake-Cheekye project. The main concerns expressed at that meeting were:

- feel the District of Squamish has been inundated with transmission lines and IPPs; the independent power project review process seems ill conceived and ill thought out;
- concerned that Municipalities do not have an earlier say on the approvals of these projects;

- feel any proposed projects should be put on hold until revisions have been made to the review process whereby municipalities are involved earlier in this process;
- belief that projects less than 20 megawatts have a limited review process and perhaps that is why projects are proposed just under 20 megawatts and are located just outside municipal boundaries;
- question the effect independent power producers will have on municipal water resources; feel B.C. Hydro should coordinate these applications;
- feel the Provincial Government should advise municipal governments on proposed power projects; and,
- feel projects outside District boundaries are not provided for comment to the District even though it may be impacted by the project.

The following issues were identified by residents of Squamish in the Open Houses:

Phase 1

- a high level of concern about the potential health effects of EMFs (including possible direct effects on children at the North Vancouver Outdoor School and indirectly on the educational program there);
- a similar level of concern about potential effects of herbicides (used for ROW clearing and maintenance) on domestic water supplies;
- property owners concerns about the proposed project's effect on private property values adjacent to the ROW and a concern over the loss of land for ROW development;
- justification for the project, including the effect that the natural gas pipeline might have on the need for a new transmission line;
- long-range plans of B.C. Hydro for further transmission development in the Kelly Lake-Cheekye corridor;
- the perceived inequitable distribution of costs and benefits associated with energy project development (and a suggestion that affected communities be awarded a tax or grant in lieu);
- potential for local economic benefits associated with the project;
- visual impacts, especially as they may detrimentally affect tourism;

- a concern by some property owners about the legal access to existing developed lots on Midnite Way; and,
- the role of independent power producers (IPPs) insofar as the transmission requirements of IPPs might be tied in with the proposed Kelly Lake–Cheekye line.

Phase 2

In response to concerns expressed by Squamish area residents at the conclusion of Phase 1, B.C. Hydro proposed several alternative route options in the southern part of the study area. Three options were identified through the Lower Cheakamus Valley including one to bypass the North Vancouver Outdoor School and the Cheakamus Indian Reserve. The "High Cheakamus" option was another alternative proposed that would run east of Highway 99 from Daisy Lake to the Cheekye Substation.

Local residents expressed the following opinions during the Phase 2 meetings:

- overwhelming support for use of the High Cheakamus route, east of Highway 99 ;
- indignation on the part of some residents that Hydro would consider spending $8 million to bypass Whistler yet not do the same for the Squamish area;
- loss of privacy and impacts on rural lifestyle resulting from further construction and right–of–way clearing;
- potential adverse health effects from EMFs for people, especially children, and livestock;
- a perception of an increase in existing problems with induction in residences near the line;
- negative impacts on visual resources and private property values;
- importance of maintaining wilderness values in the Squamish area and of not disturbing wildlife populations;
- putting the new line through the Cheakamus Valley would further alienate already limited developable land from future residential and recreational use;
- a desire by five property owners to keep the new line on the south side of the existing transmission lines into the Cheekye Substation so it doesn't encroach on their properties;

- considerable support for Hydro's efforts to communicate, both through the mail and at Open Houses; and,
- the hope that public concerns will be reflected in project planning.

B.C. Hydro Squamish Production and District Office Employees

Employees made the following points in a meeting with Project Team representatives in May 1989:

- feel there will be more opposition generally to the project this time around as compared to when the project was first announced in the early 1980s;
- anticipate opposition to be especially strong in Whistler, even though it is an urban area, since it has gone through many changes since the early 1980s; employees feel that residents in this area are very sensitive to visual impacts and are concerned that the project could have negative impacts on the quality of the resort;
- concern that the line will be needed for power export; and,
- expect strong opposition from Pemberton.

Cheakamus Residents

Phase 1

A group of residents living in the Lower Cheakamus Valley near Squamish had a number of specific concerns, during Phase 1 consultation. They initially requested a meeting with Hydro representatives prior to the first Squamish Open House to discuss these issues, then decided to wait and see what kind of information was available at the Open House. Their properties are crossed by an existing line and they have concerns about the potential health effects of EMFs and herbicides, the loss of property with an upgraded line and the process used in B.C. for approving energy projects. Many of them lease their property from the Crown and the access road along the right-of-way also provides them access to their properties. At the Open House some members of the group presented Hydro with a petition signed by about 25 residents of the Valley stating their opposition to the proposed transmission line. In response to these issues, Hydro made a commitment to investigate additional routing options.

Phase 2

From the conclusion of Phase 1 activities through to Phase 2, Hydro maintained communication with several members of this stakeholder group and agreed to a meeting with them immediately following the conclusion of the Phase 2 Squamish Open House at Brackendale. The purpose of this

meeting was to discuss the various sub-options that had been identified through the Lower Cheakamus as well as the newly proposed High Cheakamus route. Hydro Project Team members made a presentation about project status and the three sub-options under consideration in the Lower Cheakamus: the west sub-option, the east sub-option, and the south sub-option, which bypasses the North Vancouver Outdoor School and the Cheakamus Reserve. Hydro also discussed a new proposal for a High Cheakamus route, east of Highway 99 and Daisy Lake, that was presently being studied.

All the local people present expressed their strong support for the High Cheakamus route and wondered what they needed to do to register this position. They felt that the extra money required to build along this route would be insignificant compared to total project cost. Furthermore, they stated that if it was decided to bypass Whistler by using the Rainbow-Soo route (at a cost of an extra $8 million), then they would not put up with a line through their valley. With respect to Hydro's proposal to leave the existing screen of trees on the west side of the ROW if the existing ROW is used, the attendees did not support this concept but instead stated that they simply did not want a higher voltage line near their residences.

Questions were asked about recent evidence regarding EMF effects and the decision-making process for the project. Residents expressed their interest in meeting with Hydro representatives again, after the High Cheakamus route environmental and technical studies were complete.

North Vancouver Outdoor School

Phases 1 and 2

The North Vancouver Outdoor School (NVOS) is located north of Squamish on the Cheakamus River. B.C.Hydro's 2L1 right-of-way, which crosses the property, predated the construction of the school facilities. In the first phase of project planning, no special meetings were held with the North Vancouver Outdoor School, though several staff members voiced their concerns at the first Open House. They wondered about the potential health effects of EMFs, especially for the many school aged children who attend the facility to take environmental courses. Hydro communicated with the NVOS throughout the rest of Phase 1 consultation.

Prior to the Phase 2 Squamish Open House, a meeting was held at the school between representatives of the NVOS, a Squamish Band representative, and three members of the B.C. Hydro Project Team. The NVOS offers a variety of outdoor education experiences to over 4000 school-aged children each year. The School, whose property is dissected by the 2L1 line, has maintained communication with Hydro for several months to register its concerns about potential EMF effects on children, the alienation of its property by the existing line and the "philosophical" problem of the presence of a high voltage transmission line in the middle of an institution dedicated to maintaining natural environmental values.

The purpose of the June 4 1990 meeting at the school was for Hydro to update school management about the proposed south sub-option route" which would bypass the NVOS by using a route over the rock bluffs to the east of the Cheakamus River, thereby allowing for the possible removal of the existing 230 kV line from school property and from the Cheakamus Reserve. NVOS representatives and the Squamish Indian Band representative responded very positively to the proposal since it may permit both groups to reclaim property now dedicated to the 2L1 line. Subsequent correspondence from Hydro to the NVOS noted that removal of 2L1 and release of its ROW would be reviewed. Further study of the bypass route would be required to avoid conflicts with a mythological site of the Squamish Band located on these bluffs. Hydro's environmental consultants attempted to confer with members of the Band to locate the site (named Wountie), its historical significance and to discuss the routing in general, but to date the Band had not agreed to meet with B.C. Hydro's heritage consultant. The High Cheakamus route option which has recently emerged was also discussed and supported by the NVOS representatives. Subsequent to the meeting, Hydro distributed project newsletters and copies of the *Kelly Lake-Cheekye Preliminary Planning Report* both to the North Vancouver School Board and the Squamish Band.

3.4 Summary of Public Information Requests (PIRs)

The Public Information Requests (PIRs) that have been received for the Kelly Lake-Cheekye project provide a useful way for Hydro to validate the issues and concerns expressed at the project Open Houses and other meetings. All PIRs received, from the inception of the program to the end of September 1990, were organized into 33 categories (see *Appendix E*) by External Relations staff. Most categories received few requests. Those that received 10 or more requests are listed below.

B.C. Hydro / Public Relationship (38 requests)
- *general inquiries about who to contact for specific information*
- *desire to be added to mailing list*
- *requests for photos*

Electric and Magnetic Fields (36 requests)
- *information about EMF effects on health*
- *general information requested*
- *concerns about health safety relative to proximity of house to ROW*

Routing (27 requests)
- *questions about details of alignment*
- *questions about routing near homes*
- *support for generally favoured route*

Justification/Need (27 requests)

- *general questions and information requests related to justification*
- *justification for specific issues and aspects of project*

Property Impacts (25 requests)

- *fear of property devaluation as a result of B.C. Hydro construction*
- *concern over proximity of lines to property*
- *perception that Hydro had incorrectly delineated property lines*

Local Economic Benefits (13 requests)

- *requests for information about possible construction contracts*

Vegetation Management (11 requests)

- *requests for literature about B.C. Hydro practices*
- *details about chemicals used*

There is clearly a high degree of correlation between these issues and those identified throughout the Phase 1 and 2 consultation processes. It appears that the views expressed by those local residents that attended meetings for the proposed project are representative of a broader public that contacted Hydro by letter or telephone.

4.0 ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter analyzes the key region-wide issues that emerged from the two phases of public consultation completed for the Kelly Lake-Cheekye project. The chapter presents the summary views of those people who participated in the consultation program. As only a small number participated, their views may not be a statistically adequate sample of the entire population of the study area. However, it is recognized from similar studies that this type of consultation process generally involves at least the opinion leaders in the community.

Across the study area, there was little difference in the perception of the key issues, though there are some locations where certain concerns were predominant. Virtually every community, for example, expressed concerns or asked questions about EMF effects. A few issues, such as PCB storage and Independent Power Producers were important to communities adjacent to storage sites or proposed power developments (i.e., Pemberton, Birken and Squamish).

The level of interest expressed in the proposed project varied across the region. Not surprisingly, Clinton had very few concerns about the project, since it is somewhat distant from the proposed routes. The response from residents of the Seton Portage/Shalalth area was unique; they had fewer concerns with the project from the beginning of the consultation process. This may be due to the fact that B.C. Hydro is the major local employer so there is a greater than average appreciation and acceptance of transmission developments. The other community where local residents were comparatively less vocal about the project was Whistler. The reason for this lack of interest is not clear, but may be due to the predominantly week-end population which perhaps feels less committed to local development issues. In contrast, Lillooet, Birken, Pemberton and Squamish residents were very interested in the proposed project from the first phase of consultation and continued to express this interest by their attendance at Open Houses and their requests for information and special meetings.

4.2 Key Region-Wide Issues, Phase 1

This section briefly summarizes the main concerns and issues raised by the public through Phase 1 meetings, interviews and Open Houses in the study area from May to November, 1989. Issues mentioned most frequently appear at the top of the list.

Project Routing

- majority of residents support using the existing corridor

- many prefer the Pavilion (as opposed to the Antoine) route and the Anderson (as opposed to the Duffey) route
- residents support the release of those sections of 2L1 ROW no longer required for transmission line purposes.

Project Justification and Electricity Trade

- why is the line needed and is it tied into power exports?
- opposition to the concept of firm power exports
- want B.C. Hydro to make greater commitment to conservation

Electric and Magnetic Field (EMF) Effects

- perceived potential for risk to human (and farm animal) health
- want information from "neutral source", not B.C. Hydro
- site specific concerns near private homes and schools (Pemberton, Squamish, Gates Lake)

Visual Impacts

- potential adverse aesthetic effects
- desire to minimize visual impacts balanced by desire to protect wilderness from development

Vegetation Management

- opposition to use of chemical herbicides
- support for hand clearing

Property Issues

- declining property values
- property owners near proposed routes concerned about disturbance to activities and land use

Possibility of Economic and other Benefits

- interest in local job creation
- desire for project associated benefits, i.e., upgrading of Highline Road along Anderson Lake
- small rural communities bear costs of power development but reap few benefits
- some communities want compensation, for example, in the form of taxation or financial contributions from Hydro

PCB Storage

- concern in Birken and Pemberton areas that Hydro has not addressed issue of secure PCB storage.

4.3 Key Region-Wide Issues, Phase 2

As the listing of issues below indicates, there was a shift in the public's perception of the most critical project-related issues since November 1989, at the conclusion of Phase 1 consultation activities. In part this may have been due to more detailed route specific information becoming available; in part due to outstanding questions being answered by Hydro representatives.

Several concerns were the same and reflect a priority similar to that evident in Phase 1. These included: EMF effects, property issues, visual impacts and benefits for impacted communities. Two issues at the top of the list in Phase 1, project justification and electricity export, were not even included as Phase 2 concerns because they were very infrequently mentioned; only two or three individuals asked questions about these topics. Another important concern during Phase 1 that received very little attention during this second round of consultation was vegetation management, perhaps because the public understood that B.C. Hydro primarily employs manual and mechanical methods of control (rather than chemical) in the region. PCB storage and Meager Creek/IPPs (Independent Power Producers) which were secondary issues last fall, were infrequently mentioned in the second phase.

Two "new" issues (relative to Phase 1 findings) became more important during Phase 2. The first of these was "future development" or potential project impacts on future land use, especially in narrow valley bottoms where developable land is at a premium (Pemberton, Birken, Squamish and Whistler).

The second was "long range planning" or the concern of area residents that B.C. Hydro should employ a long range view in planning energy developments so that the Kelly Lake-Cheekye corridor does not become the route for yet another transmission line.

For the most part, residents continued to support what has been designated the "generally-favoured route" which follows the existing corridor. There was still no consensus for routing in the Whistler area at the end of Phase 2. A number of residents of the Squamish area clearly favoured the newly-proposed High Cheakamus route.

Property Value and Other Property Impacts

Property owners in the vicinity of the existing or proposed right-of-way had numerous concerns about the project. Several perceived that the construction of a high voltage line would have detrimental effects on their

property value. Two individuals were particularly sensitive to the property value issue: one recently bought and another was about to buy property adjacent to the proposed new line, apparently without any knowledge of B.C. Hydro's proposal. Other landowners who acquired property in the Cheakamus Valley adjacent to the existing 2L1 line during the last eight or nine years claimed that they had not understood that Hydro had the legal right to install additional works on its ROW in the future. These property owners and others felt that project construction and operation would be destructive to their rural lifestyle; that the transmission line itself represented the type of development that they hoped to avoid by moving into the study area. Residents close to the existing 2L1 line in the Cheakamus Valley cited problems such as noise, shocks and health issues (see below) that they associated with EMF effects. They considered a higher voltage line would only exacerbate the situation. Another property issue was the potential for additional clearing required for a 500 kV line. Residents wanted little or no further clearing because it would decrease their existing visual screen from the line.

EMF Effects

The perceived potential for adverse health effects from electric and magnetic fields continued to be an issue in the study area. Many residents asked for more detailed information about such issues as: the strength of fields relative to distance from the transmission lines; possible shielding from the fields; any association between EMFs and other diseases such as arthritis; and, the association between EMFs and childhood leukemia.

Significant advances have not been made in the past year in the research effort to establish whether EMFs cause health problems. There was limited "new" information to report to the public, at this round of Open Houses. B.C. Hydro has made a commitment to keep people informed about the EMF issue and has addressed all specific inquiries to date. Residents, however, feel that in the absence of proof for or against health risks, that they are being forced to act as "guinea pigs" and they have stated their refusal to do so. They pointed out that it takes years of research to verify the safety of certain substances such as chemicals. They base this concern on the problems that have developed during the years of use of "safe" chemical substances that are now identified as hazardous. They felt that B.C. Hydro should bear this uncertainty in mind and route the new and existing transmission lines away from areas of human habitation.

B.C. Hydro has appointed an EMF Issues Manager, Kelly Gibney Ph.D.,who attended Open Houses and made special presentations to several groups in an effort to answer residents' questions. B.C. Hydro has prepared a report detailing the magnetic, and to a lesser extent, electric fields at nine areas of residential density along the existing and proposed transmission line routes. Residential proximity to the line has also been surveyed. Dr. Gibney has spoken with and/or sent out detailed information packages to all people who expressed an interest in more EMF information. An even more

comprehensive EMF information package was sent to three regional libraries along the line route.

Visual Impacts

Compared to the fall of 1989, comments about potential visual impacts associated with the project were less specific and less numerous during the second phase of consultation in 1990. People referred generally to "visual pollution" from transmission lines and the resulting effects on residential and recreational land use. Residents of the Lower Cheakamus area cited visual impacts as another reason why they didn't want a new transmission line down the valley (even though it would be replacing the existing 2L1), especially if it required more clearing. Many area residents wanted Hydro to do as much as possible to reduce visual impacts by careful alignment, screening and unobtrusive tower design (possibly painting and similar measures). Many people wanted to consolidate existing and any new lines to reduce visual clutter and wanted to keep new lines out of wilderness areas to protect the aesthetic qualities of these areas.

Future Development

Project impacts on future land development emerged as a significant concern during Phase 2 consultations. The permanent alienation of developable land along valley bottoms, especially in Pemberton and Squamish, and to a more limited extent in Birken and Whistler, was frequently mentioned as a serious problem. These communities are experiencing growth pressures, yet have limited developable land at their disposal. Many residents were adamantly opposed to the construction of a new transmission line directly through valley bottoms.

Long Range Planning

Another concern that was more predominant in the second phase of consultation was the perception that B.C. Hydro has not placed enough emphasis on long range energy planning. Many area residents felt that Hydro should be planning for the far distant future and should consider doubling up circuits and building towers that can accommodate more voltage. They felt that the Kelly Lake-Cheekye corridor has accommodated enough transmission lines and did not want to experience the disruption of yet another new line (in addition to the current proposal) in the foreseeable future.

Environmental Impacts

The potential for detrimental project impacts on wilderness environment was generally viewed by area residents as an important issue. The desire to protect natural areas from disturbance was clear by the general support for the use of the existing corridor. Many people who live in the study area do so because they value the wilderness or lifestyle qualities it has to offer. They agreed that there is a need for transmission lines, but not the need to build them through unspoiled landscapes. At the same time, residents in

some locations, such as the Cheakamus Valley, were adamantly opposed to any new lines in their vicinity and felt that their concerns should take precedence over preservation of natural values on undeveloped land; for this reason they preferred the High Cheakamus route.

Benefits for Impacted Communities

Despite the fact that most communities in the study area are in the Lower Mainland region (for transmission system planning purposes) and therefore would receive electricity benefits from the Kelly Lake-Cheekye project, people in the area felt that they pay the costs of such developments in return for very limited benefits. Some residents of the Birken area, for example, suggested that Hydro should compensate them (perhaps with a community facility) for all the costs they have borne as a result of living with several transmission lines. Residents of Seton/Shalalth likewise hoped to receive project-related benefits in the form of an upgraded and maintained Highline Road.

Attitude Toward B.C. Hydro

There has been a considerable change in the way many members of the study area public view B.C. Hydro and its efforts to consult them about the proposed project. Hydro received several compliments about its consultation process including its thorough newsletter distribution, excellent visual displays and knowledgeable Project Team representatives. But even more important is the fact that the consultation was seen as significantly more open and responsive than it was during the 1982-83 Kelly Lake-Cheekye consultation process. Although there was still skepticism about the degree to which public concerns would be integrated into project planning, area residents felt that Hydro had spent the time to listen, and address questions and concerns.

4.4 Evaluation of the Consultation Process

The public consultation process for the proposed Kelly Lake-Cheekye project made a very positive contribution to project development, specifically route selection and refinement. As a result of public input, a number of new route options were investigated by B.C. Hydro, including the High Cheakamus and south Cheakamus (past the North Vancouver Outdoor School) routes and the 'Function' sub-option at the southern end of Whistler. The integration of these public concerns into route planning validated Hydro's claim that it was indeed open to feasible suggestions. Hydro's responsiveness was also indicated by the fact that it agreed to hold Open Houses on request (and did so for the Seton Lake Band) and that it made special arrangements to meet with key stakeholder groups (such as the Yalakom residents) on site.

A number of local residents remained skeptical of B.C. Hydro's actions. They were not convinced that Hydro would integrate their concerns; rather they believed that Hydro had already made decisions about the project that

it would not change. Based on the response obtained from people attending the Open Houses, the people holding this view were in the minority.

In general the response from the study area public to Hydro's consultation process (as noted on the exit surveys and heard at the Open Houses) was extremely positive. At the beginning of the process in the summer of 1989, many local residents were suspicious of B.C. Hydro's intentions and still harboring resentment after the first Kelly Lake-Cheekye consultation program in the early 1980s. By the end of Phase 2 activities for the current proposal, in September 1990, local people believed that Hydro was a great deal more open and honest and that Hydro representatives were taking the time to listen. People liked the way Hydro was communicating, in newsletters and in the Open Houses. They expressed the strong desire that their concerns would be responded to and that Hydro would continue to keep them involved in the planning process.

There were some criticisms of the consultation process. During Phase 1 a few local residents felt that they had not received sufficient notice about the Open Houses because the local paper advertisements had not included a list of all the Open Houses in the region. This situation was remedied in Phase 2 by placing ads that included all the Open Houses. A second concern was the number of B.C.Hydro project team representatives relative to the few attendees at some of the Open Houses, especially during the first phase. However it was difficult to gauge the size of turnout for meetings, or the specific interests of those attending, in advance.

5.0 Conclusions and Consultant Recommendations For Phase 3 Public Consultation

At the conclusion of the Phase 2 public consultation activities, considerable progress has been made in communicating project information to the study area public and in integrating their concerns and opinions into the project planning process. Several modifications to routing, for example the High Cheakamus route, have been identified based on public input.

Some issues such as vegetation management and project justification, which were initial concerns, have assumed less importance as B.C. Hydro has answered the public's questions. Less success is evident in resolving the more "complex" issue of the perceived potential for health effects from EMFs. This is an issue that may require ongoing research for clarification. However, Hydro is committed to keeping interested members of the public informed about the most recent research findings.

B.C. Hydro is now investigating routes avoiding the Pavilion, Bridge River, Seton and Lokla Reserves, which will require significant departures from the "generally favoured route" and may conflict with public opinion at various locations. A separate report on Native Consultation has been prepared by Hydro.

Prior to the submission of the Energy Project Certificate application to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources, B.C. Hydro plans to conduct a third phase of consultation. The limited time available for this phase necessitates a focussed approach. The consultant's recommendations for Phase 3 public consultation include the following:

1. Information distributed to area residents as soon as possible about the proposed non-Reserve routes under consideration

2. Consultation with property owners adjacent to the generally favoured route and any alternatives which are presented in the EPC application.

3. The distribution of the third project newsletter as soon as possible (and prior to the submission of the application) to every household in the study area.

4. The distribution of an information package to those on the mailing list, elected officials, native Bands, and other key stakeholders. The package should include a letter summarizing project status, as well as summaries of the consultation report and the application. This package should be distributed as close as possible to the time the application is submitted.

5. Meetings, as required, with key stakeholder groups that have outstanding concerns.

6. Meetings with the Squamish-Lillooet Regional District Advisory Group, to keep members updated on project status.

7. Continued prompt response to public inquiries about the project or more general questions, through the Public Information Request (PIR) process.

8. The distribution of copies of the consultation report and the application document to the nine Information Centres and the Hydro District Offices in the study area.

If the project is approved, a consultation process for the design and construction phases will be required. Consultation will be conducted by Hydro Properties' representatives, and construction site representatives among others. Examples of activities that could be included in future phases are:

- ❑ Ongoing communication with study area residents through, for example, periodic project newsletters.
- ❑ Ongoing communication (including EMF updates when they are available) with all stakeholder groups and upon request by letter or by telephone.
- ❑ Project-related information to be provided at all established Information Centres.
- ❑ Provision of information about employment opportunities and anticipated construction impacts to those individuals and communities affected.
- ❑ Ongoing public access to the project planning and construction team and response to public inquiries and concerns.
- ❑ Consultation contact with property owners.
- ❑ Ongoing B.C. Hydro Employees consultation/communications.